

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: January 20, 2002
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
January 16, 2002 (Meeting #25)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jim Robertson	Town of Yacolt Mayor
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Ken Hadley	Self
Laura Hudson	David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Denise Lukins	Blair Schaefer Hutchison & Wolfe
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Kate Bowie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Gordon Euler	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager

Oliver Orjiako
Rod Orlando
Elise Scolnick
Marty Snell
Bryan Snodgrass
Josh Warner

Clark County Long Range Planning
City of Yacolt – EES Consulting
Clark County Long Range Planning
City of Camas Planner
City of Vancouver Planner
Clark County Community Development

1. Introductions

Commissioner Stanton called the meeting to order at 4:00. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Review December 19, 2001 meeting notes.

Stanton questions a statistic that was included in the summary notes. The City of Battle Ground is said to have 2.1 jobs per households. This is not correct and is hereby removed from the December 19, 2001, notes.

3. Report from cities on population allocation

Cities want to include a 5% assumption for critical lands in the model. A handout updates the factors that are in the model. Holmes gave an overview for the cities on this topic. No precise numbers are to be presented now. Washougal and Yacolt did not participate in the meetings of the cities. The caveats to the agreement among the cities are that they are at different stages in the planning process and they want full buyoff from elected officials. The second is that all allocations anticipate agreement on a balance of employment for jobs/housing balance. This is being discussed at the staff level. County staff has not yet reviewed the proposal. Anderson from Washougal is not yet ready to commit to the allocations, but they are close. Robertson said the figures for Yacolt are not accurate for residential and commercial. Orlando (Yacolt) said that they will be working on the numbers. The numbers may change if sewer is installed.

4. Next steps in Comprehensive Plan Review Process

Lee distributed a handout with the preliminary and target dates. The goal is to finish the process in 2003. The information from the cities will be a driver for many of the other dates. The public involvement process will have a key component of looking at capital facilities. Involvement will also solicit what alternatives people may want evaluated. There is a contract with CRECD underway. This is focused on land supply for employment. It will inform the employment allocation process.

Harris wants to report out about the population allocation for the City of Vancouver. She said it is now 1,250. They want the county to possibly give credit for existing or shifting density from 'neighborhoods' to 'activity centers' or expansion of the UGA.

5. Briefing – Economic Development Strategy Scope of Work

This is a review of the scope of work with CREDC. Lee passed out a handout for this discussion. The tasks are outlined in the handout. Task 1-4 of Appendix B will be completed first and they are considered key to land use decisions. CREDC is currently working on task 2 – Inventory and Analysis. January 24th there are two sub-committees meeting. They will be working with a survey firm to see if they can work on task 2.4 - commuting issues.

Pridemore asks if there are high-tech people interested. Lee responds that it is a self-selected group. The committee might try to recruit high-tech people to be involved. The plan goes beyond land use.

6. Briefing – Capital Facilities Data Collection and Analysis

Lee introduced Laura Hudson (David Evans and Assoc.). More detailed info will be presented at the work session on January 30th. They are hired to update the capital facilities plan. There are obviously more demands than funding. We are always behind the curve for need. The commissioners want to promote family wage job development. The strategy is a focused public investment strategy. They are looking at existing and what is close to those areas and where you can locate new industries. Other areas will also need additional help. These are priority areas instead of simply having a list. Focus on 'growth zones'. First, you define the type of development that you want. Then identify the particular needs of the focused industry that you want to attract. Then look at vacant and underutilized lands and what infrastructure is available to the lands. They are trying to get information from service providers to gather what infrastructure exists and if it is mapped in GIS. Are there maps of problem areas and areas with excess capacity? Where are your priorities for future expansion and what are your growth needs? Also, what are the easiest places in your system to expand? Ask about the standards that are used to meet customer needs. If you are going to expand, where is it easiest and what type of development can you service? It is only public services that were surveyed. If a key industry needed a particular service that is private, we can get that info at that time. The focus is on public investment.

There is a large amount of info available. Many master plans have been updated since 1994. Providers are providing info. They are still waiting for some info. GIS will be used to map the capacities and service standards. The approach seems as if it will be useful.

Harris asks about telecommunications, high-speed internet. Can we gather information? DeRidder asks about the January 30th meeting. How does this research fit in with GMA planning and not just along the I-5 corridor. How can we get them to locate near existing residential areas even if it is not the cheapest option? How will the options be weighed? Pridemore responds that we are still at the stage of finding areas and then we will have to make the decisions. Cheapest is not the only goal. Lee says that this group will be involved after the decisions are made on the 30th. The second step will be looking at what will be used as criteria. Pridemore asks about other barriers being flagged, such as sewer connections. Hudson says that this will be incorporated in the cost analysis. Lee restates that the population allocations will need to work hand in hand with this process. Stanton

says the 30th meeting is to make the decision as to moving forward with this idea and type of analysis. This is a county-wide plan. Kufeldt-Antle says this will be helpful to the cities and reflect on existing planning scenarios. Lee says that more detail will come out as we focus on specific areas.

7. Next meeting date and time

The question came up with the frequency of meetings. The meeting time is good. People like the forum and the frequency. The agenda is largely driven by what county staff can pull together to present and discuss.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - january 16 2001(#25).doc